



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,408	04/19/2004	Viswanathan Lakshmanan	03-2644 81693	4517
24319	7590	10/17/2006	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			PARIHAR, SUCHIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/828,408

Applicant(s)

LAKSHMANAN ET AL.

Examiner

Suchin Parihar

Art Unit

2825

–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

THE REPLY FILED 01 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): claims 3-5 and 8-10.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: 3-5 and 8-10.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, 6 and 7.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

PAUL DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Paul Dinh

The amendments made to claims 1 and 6 fail to place the application into a condition for allowance.

With respect to Applicant's remarks filed 9/1/2006, Applicant asserts that Morgan does not teach or suggest the claimed list of incremental changes that include all polygons added to the IC design and all polygons deleted from the IC design. Examiner disagrees with this assertion. The prior art of record teaches: the list of incremental changes including all new polygons added to the integrated circuit design and all polygons deleted from the integrated circuit design. Specifically, Morgan teaches a physical design tool that identifies changes [list of incremental changes] that must be made to the database including the addition and deletion of cells [polygons added and polygons deleted from the IC design] (see Morgan, Col 2, lines 50-55).

With respect to Applicant's remarks filed 9/1/2006, Applicant asserts Sung does not teach or suggest translating the claimed marked integrated circuit design database to the claimed file in generic data stream format. Examiner disagrees with this assertion. Sung teaches a netlist that undergoes place & route [i.e. translation] into a physical view GDS file (see Sung, Fig 5).

Applicant's remarks filed 9/1/2006 overcome the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 3-5 and 8-10 set forth in the final office action dated 8/15/2006. These claims are currently objected to for depending on a rejected base claim, and might be considered allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim(s). The indication of claims 3-5 and 8-10 as allowable subject matter requires further examination and/or search.



Suchin Parihar
Examiner
AU 2825
571-272-6210



PAUL DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER